



## FORUM ON CUG

This new activity is in response to the CUG Programming Committee's call for a written debate on the CUG Report. The Committee invites members of the University Community, academic and non-academic, to submit *brief statements concerning any of the issues raised in the CUG Report*. These should be addressed to the Editor of the *Bulletin* or the Editor of *The Varsity*. Both periodicals are co-operating in the Committee's important effort to stimulate discussion. Material submitted to one paper will be made available to the other, unless the writer specifically requests that it appear in only one paper.

### Arthur Kruger

The Report of the Commission on University Government rejects the concept of equality of all members of the University community. Nowhere in the report do the commissioners recommend that the principle of "one man, one vote" should be followed in the selection of those who govern. Instead they argue that there are distinct estates in the University community each with its own area of competence and interest. This is the basis for their recommendation that faculty and students have parity of membership on various councils of the University and for the suggestion that the support staff have a more limited role in university government. The Commission failed to come to grips with the implications inherent in the recognition of different estates. If there are estates and if they differ in competence and interests, these differences should be acknowledged in the roles assigned to the estates. Members of the Commission fail to explain why parity on virtually all governing bodies of the University would follow from their earlier discussion of the estates.

### Appointment, Tenure and Promotion Policy

Let me begin by discussing a very controversial issue of the student role in the appointment and personnel policy of the University as it relates to members of the academic staff. I fully endorse the following principles enunciated by OCUFA in the Newsletter Vol. 3, No. 2, November 19, 1969:

"Preamble: The focus of University reform has now shifted to policy and decision making at the departmental and faculty levels, especially with respect to appointments, promotions, and granting of tenure to faculty. The faculty welcomes a thorough-going review of departmental, faculty and university structures and procedures and any changes that will improve university teaching and research. The following propositions which are in accord with the CAUT-

### JANUARY 22 DEADLINE

*University of Toronto Bulletin* is published by Department of Information, Room 225, Simcoe Hall. All material for the next issue should be in the hands of the editor, Mrs. Winogene Ferguson (928-2102) by noon on the 22nd of January.

OCUFA policy on appointment, promotion and tenure are principles that should guide reforms in this area.

### "Principles:

"(1) Faculty should have the right to participate in the processes leading to appointment, promotion and award of tenure. It is understood that each department and university will develop its own machinery for accomplishing this in a practical way.

"(2) The appropriate contribution of students to decisions concerning the appointments, promotions and tenure of individual faculty members is the evaluation of their teaching ability. The appropriate form for this contribution to take is that of consultation.

"(3) Procedures for formal consultation with students should be established.

"(4) Students should have no entitlement to decision-making powers concerning the appointment, promotion and tenure of individual faculty members. This limitation is not meant to prejudice the question of student decision-making powers on matters of curriculum."

My own views would lead me to go somewhat further than the OCUFA statement. I would argue that this University should establish a very explicit policy on the relative weights to be assigned for research, working with students, and general performance of departmental, faculty and university governance, in decisions on tenure and promotion. (In my view the concept of teaching should be broadened to go beyond the classroom work that a professor does and to include his work with

(See page 2, col. 1)

## The Implementation and Programming Committee for the Campbell Report

Pursuant to the statement of President Bissell on October 1st, 1969, this Committee has been appointed "to initiate discussion, to formulate recommendations, and to facilitate implementation" of the Report of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Disciplinary Procedures (the "Campbell Report").

Under its mandate, the Committee invites all members of the University community, alumni and other interested persons, to make oral and/or written submissions to it on any aspect of the Campbell Report.

Notification of the intention to make an oral submission should be made to the Secretary of the Committee no later than February 1st, 1970 and the submissions will be scheduled for hearing before the Committee during the month of February.

Written submissions should be forwarded to the Secretary by February 15th, 1970 addressed to:

The Secretary,  
The Campbell Implementation and Programming Committee,  
Office of the Vice-President and Registrar,  
Simcoe Hall,  
University of Toronto,  
Toronto.

Telephone 928-2182  
928-8794



DR. A. T. JOUSSE, centre, Director of the Division of Rehabilitation Medicine, was presented with *Selected Papers on Rehabilitation of Spinal Injuries*, compiled by the Canadian Paraplegic Association's Winnipeg Branch, by G. K. Langford, left, the Association's Managing Director, and Andrew Clarke, Assistant Managing Director. At left, rear, is Professor Isabel M. Robinson, head of Occupational Therapy, and at right, Professor Ruth O. F. Bradshaw, head of Physiotherapy.

## COMING EVENTS

### JANUARY

#### 15 THURSDAY

##### Lectures

"The Contemporary Brazilian Novel in the Context of Latin America". Prof. Gregory Rabassa, City University of New York. Room 1083, Sidney Smith Hall. 4 p.m. (School of Graduate Studies and Department of Italian and Hispanic Languages and Literatures)

"Animal Imagery in Romanesque Sculpture: the Trumeau of Souillac". Prof. Harry Bober, Institute of Fine Arts, New York University. Room 2118, Sidney Smith Hall, 4 p.m. (Centre for Medieval Studies and School of Graduate Studies)

"Wind and Wave Measurement in the High Atmosphere from Meteor Trail Radar Detection". Dr. A. Spizzichino, Centre National d'Etude des Telecommunication, Paris. Room 102, Burton Tower, 4 p.m. (School of Graduate Studies and Department of Physics)

"Finalism Revisited" series. "The Case for the Mechanical Cause". Prof. Etienne Gilson. Carr Hall, St. Michael's College. 4.10 p.m. (Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies)

##### Seminar

"Elizabethan Translations of Heroic Poetry". Prof. Reuben Brower, Harvard University. Room 341, Larkin Building, Trinity College. 11 a.m. (School of Graduate Studies, Graduate Department of Classical Studies and Graduate Program in Comparative Literature)

##### Music

Paul Brodie, Saxophone. Concert Hall, Edward Johnson Building. 2 p.m. Free. (Faculty of Music)

University of Toronto Symphony Orchestra. Conductor, Victor Feldbrill. MacMillan Theatre, Edward Johnson Building. 8.30 p.m. Free. (Faculty of Music)

#### 16 FRIDAY

##### Lecture

"Problems of Objectivity in the Social Sciences". Prof. Richard Rudner, chairman of the Department of Philosophy, Washington University, St. Louis, and editor of the *Journal of Philosophy of Science*. Room 202, McLennan Physical Laboratories. 1.10 p.m. Sponsored by the Varsity Fund. (Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology)

##### Seminars

"Elemental Animal Imagery". Prof. Harry Bober. Room 1069, Sidney Smith Hall, 4 p.m. (Centre for Medieval Studies and School of Graduate Studies)

"Granites, Solutions and Base-Metal Deposits". Prof. Heinrich D. Holland, Princeton University. Room 128, Mining Building. 5 p.m. (The Toronto Geological Discussion Group and Department of Geology)

##### Athletics

Hockey. Guelph at Varsity. Varsity Arena. 8 p.m.

(See page 4, col. 1)



# FORUM ON CUG

(Continued from page 1)

students both in and out of the classroom. It is for this reason that I have recommended the term working with students rather than teaching.) While I have no commitment to any particular set of weights for each of these functions I feel that in order to achieve the goal of providing adequate recognition to those who excel in working with students, the weight assigned to this should not vary greatly from that assigned to research. Weights might differ somewhat depending on the decision to be made. For example, the weight assigned to working with students might be somewhat higher in the tenure decision than in the decision to promote to full professor.

To illustrate the sort of system I propose here let me provide an example of how this would work. In a given personnel decision someone might be required to receive a total of 50 out of a possible 100 points in order to receive the reward in question. A maximum of 40 points might be assigned for research ability, 40 points for working with students and perhaps the remaining 20 points for the performance of committee assignments and so on. The Chairman or Dean would evaluate the man on each of the three criteria and assign him a rating. The total rating would decide whether the man warranted promotion or tenure. It might be necessary to achieve a certain score on a given factor (e.g., research) as well as the specified overall score, in order to receive the promotion.

In assessing a man's research capabilities the Chairman or Dean would rely on the judgment of faculty members within the University and perhaps some outside the University. In judging teaching abilities (broadly defined) the Chairman would decide on the basis of course evaluations, surveys of graduate students who had studied under the man concerned and the expression of opinion by alumni.

An aggrieved faculty member could appear to an impartial Tripartite Arbitration Tribunal against the decision of a Chairman or Dean. In his appeal he could call on students, and former students, as well as on members of the faculty to testify on his behalf. The onus of proving arbitrary or discriminatory action by the Chairman or Dean of course would rest on the aggrieved party.

I would endorse the Neufeld and CUG recommendations that these personnel decisions be made by an individual (Chairman or Dean) rather than by a committee. In this way, the man responsible for the decision would have to explain his action and could be taken to binding and impartial arbitration in the event that the decision was challenged.

In my view this is the most effective sort of device for ensuring that working with students will receive the kind of weight that CUG commissioners thought it should receive. It is far superior to that proposal for a small committee of students to decide on the teaching merits of a member of the academic staff.

## The Parity Issue

The CUG Report proposes faculty-student parity in the top governing council of the University. While it attempts to avoid the issue of the relative numbers of faculty and students on other governing bodies in the University, the recommendation that the decisions on this matter be made by parity committees in fact would indicate that in virtually all cases what would emerge would be parity committees in departments, colleges and faculties. Apart from the suggestion that parity would have psychological benefits for the student body in assuring them that they were treated as equals, there is no real justification for parity as against any other possible proportions of faculty and students on the governing bodies at the various levels of the University.

In my view the concept of student participation in the governance of departments is very questionable, at least in the Faculty of Arts. In that Faculty,

the new program means that no student is attached to any particular department. This is reflected in the fact that there are no compulsory courses nor any identifiable programs (with the exception perhaps of Commerce and Finance). It is also evident in the rather apathetic response of students to the formation of course unions in various departments in the Faculty of Arts and Science during the current year. There is little basis for student involvement in the governance of departments. This is not to deny student interest in departmental decisions. However, that interest might reflect itself in ways other than participation in the government of departments.

Most students in the Faculty of Arts and Science are enrolled in colleges. They should be involved in the government of colleges, although not on the basis of parity with faculty. (*Colleges vary greatly in their composition, history and functions and I hesitate to recommend any overall formula for college governance. The attempt to impose a uniform pattern on all colleges is neither practical nor desirable.*) Through their participation in college government they should have some role in the governance of the Faculty of Arts and Science and the right to sit on at least some of the committees of that Faculty. In particular, I think that they should sit on the Curriculum Committee and through this Committee they would exert influence on departmental decision making in the areas that affect them.

On the Council of the Faculty of Arts itself I would not argue for parity between faculty and students. Indeed I think what is required is sufficient student representation to see that student opinion is voiced on Council. The preponderance of membership on the Council of the Faculty of Arts should continue to remain members of the academic faculty. On some committees students should be barred from membership. This would include the committees on admissions, examinations, standards, promotion, tenure and other faculty personnel decisions. On some committees of council, students might have parity with faculty members and indeed there may be committees on which students should have the preponderance of membership. The composition of committees should depend on the nature of the issues to be discussed by the committees and the question of the relative competence and interest of faculty and students.

## The Top Governing Council

I recognize the validity of many of the arguments against the present bicameral form of government. We must distinguish between the deficiencies of bicameral governance *per se* and the inadequacies of the particular kind of bicameralism that now prevails at this University. There are after all other ways of selecting the members of the governing bodies and of dividing responsibilities between them. Readers of the *Bulletin* might look at the recent proposals made by Prof. Crispo for one possible alternative which retains bicameralism (or even creates "tricameralism") but changes the functions and method of appointment of each of the governing bodies.

In my view, it would be a mistake to abandon bicameralism in favour of a unicameral top governing body. I feel that we should retain a lay Board composed solely of members drawn from outside the University. A lay Board can provide the sort of expertise required for many of the complex financial decisions that must be made in an institution the size of this University. It can provide a disinterested body that can mediate between warring factions in the University community. Most important of all, it can provide a strong and credible voice in presenting our case to the public particularly in the event of disputes with the Province of Ontario.

Those who argue that formula financing eliminates any risk of government interference in our affairs are naive. Formula weights can be altered to the advantage or disadvantage of a given university. Think of what a change in

the weight for graduate instruction would do to the relative income of this and other universities in the Province. Similarly, formula financing will never become the sole basis for financing universities. Special grants will always be required for purposes not adequately covered by formula grants. This is particularly true in capital grants but applies to operating revenue as well.

Governments retain strong powers to reward or punish particular universities even within the framework of formula financing. If this University became embroiled in a battle with the Province, a lay Board would be in a much better position to win public support than would a Board composed largely of faculty and students. An internal Board would always be accused of pursuing the selfish interests of members of the University rather than the interests of the community.

If we abandon a lay Board, I doubt whether the Province will entrust to us many of the decisions now made by the Board of Governors. They are unlikely to believe that "campus politicians" (whether of the ATS or SAC variety) possess the competence to manage the enormous public investment in this University. I predict that most of the powers of our Board will be transferred to the Committee on University Affairs or a similar body. We will once again have a bicameral system with one of the governing bodies attached to the Government and with a jurisdiction over all the universities of the Province. The CUG proposals will lead to the "University of Ontario" in fact if not in name even though most supporters of CUG would oppose this kind of development.

We also require a body similar in its powers to the Senate for dealing with decisions involving academic policy. It should be representative of the various constituent divisions in the University but not so large as to be ineffective. Its role should be confined largely to planning of academic priorities and programs rather than "rubber stamping" decisions made by other bodies.

If we are going to retain bicameralism but eliminate the deficiencies in our current arrangements, we will need to study very carefully the powers and the composition of each of the two governing bodies. I have not reached any firm conclusions on these matters but would suggest consideration of the following principles:

(1) The Board of Governors (or its successor) should be composed of lay members. Members of the faculty or student body should not be permitted to serve on this Board.

(2) The Board should not be much larger than the current Board of Governors.

(3) Members of the Board might continue to be appointed by the Government. However all appointments should be confined to those nominated by faculty, students or alumni. In my view, the faculty and alumni should make most of the nominations. The Government should receive a list of nominees that exceeds the number of appointments that will be made. The mechanics of nomination must be worked out.

(4) Nominees should be sought from a variety of groups in society.

(5) The faculty should predominate on the Senate (or its successor). There should be alumni and student representation. Members of the Senate should be elected by defined constituencies.

(6) The membership of the Senate should not exceed one hundred in number. Most of its work should be done in committees.

(7) Routine decisions of other bodies should not require Senate ratification. The Senate should delegate authority to faculties and colleges. It should concern itself with questions involving long range academic planning.

(8) The current division of powers between Board and Senate seems to have worked reasonably well. There is no evidence to indicate that the Board has intervened in academic matters. However, I recognize that the line between financial issues and matters of academic policy is not clear. Any division of authority and responsibility is bound to result in some uncertainty over jurisdiction and in some tension and conflict between those who share power.

From time to time, these two bodies may find themselves in conflict with one another.

(9) The President must continue to command sufficient support within and without the university community so that he can effectively mediate conflicts between the two governing bodies or between other divisions of the University. He must also retain sufficient power to make decisions including many that are bound to be unpopular with some of his numerous constituents.

It should be obvious that while I support a bicameral form of government, I oppose the current arrangements at this University. Reform is long overdue. I possess neither the knowledge nor the competence to outline the precise nature of the new bicameral structure. We should immediately create the machinery for careful study of this matter. Because I concur in the view of CUG that the decision on the top governing body will in the long run determine the nature of university governance at all levels, I would like to see a full debate on a variety of alternative proposals before any final decision is reached.

ARTHUR KRUGER

Professor of Economics

Chairman, Division of Social Sciences  
Scarborough College

★ ★ ★

## F. E. Sparshott

The case for a unicameral governing council is that administration may no longer be possible without it. A university president faced with opposed sets of "non-negotiable" demands from those purporting to represent faculty, students and laity is in a position in which he would be a fool to remain. But that is the position in which administrators now are. In a unicameral council, in the unlikely event of one of the three groups of elected persons agreeing unanimously on anything, it must still persuade at least half of at least one of the other groups to get a majority. Of course, confrontations between the three groups at governing council level would be disastrous. It can hardly occur if students and faculty are jointly involved at all levels in running the University—as is coming to be the normal practice.

Extreme and unrepresentative positions will continue to be voiced by students, faculty and laity alike, and in times of stress will gain a following. One hopes they will always be heard, because they are often right when the rest of us are wrong. But they should not be taken as *representing* the rest of us. Some of my colleagues fear that the student voice in the proposed new institutions would be (as it sometimes is now) that of unrepresentative extremists. To avoid this, a reasonably large proportion of the student body must be involved in university affairs. The weakness of the CUG proposals lies in the lack of any evidence that this can be done, just as the weakness of the university as a whole lies in the presence of a lot of students who will neither take an active part in anything that goes on there nor go away. This seems to me a good argument for the CUG proposals: a university in which they won't work ought not to exist. The existence of the University of Toronto is not an *unconditional* good. Still, it is a problem: student activism, like many other social phenomena, goes in cycles (11-year, like sunspots?), and CUG does not say how student participation can be made meaningful in passivist phases. It is easier to put the finger on faculty, though some of us are pretty tired of being fingered.

The principle of parity seems necessary in the governing council, for the reasons given. Elsewhere its justification is partly that it prevents confrontations being ironed out by steamrollers, but mainly that no other principle of equal generality has the least plausibility. A doctrinaire imposition of the principle across the board would surely be ludicrous.

Student participation at all levels is not an unmixed good—everything takes much longer—but its advantages are coming to be recognized. Students tend to be unaware of the practical "limiting factors" that more experienced men take for granted; which is good, because the

(See page 3, col. 3)



## SAC favours Support Staff bid for representation on future Council

The Students' Administrative Council voted in favour of the participation of the support staff in the projected governing council of the University, on Wednesday, Jan. 7.

The motion, proposed by Ken McEvoy, included the proviso that any member of the support staff be eligible to serve on the council, and all members eligible to vote. Mr. McEvoy said that he included the rider partly as a matter of principle, and partly to discourage the formation of a "company union" which might exclude workers already unionized.

The preamble to the motion recognizes that there exists, in addition to students and faculty, "a third estate of those not directly concerned with the academic functions of the University". As well as reaffirming the right of all people to have "a direct say in the structures and decisions which affect their lives", the preamble recognizes the value of incorporating the third estate in the governance of the University "for its point of view, experience, and involvement in the University community".

The motion offers support for the "request of the support staff for membership on the governing council" and goes on to "suggest that the council could consist of representative groups of equal membership drawn from the faculty, the students, the support staff, and lay people" and that "ex officio administrative membership be included within the support staff segment".

R. A. K. Richards, of the University Planning Division, said that he was "delighted" with the motion, but that he did not think the details of its content were important. Emphasizing first that he spoke only for himself, Mr. Richards declared that "if this council goes on record as supporting the recognition of the existence of an estate consisting of support staff which should have a say in the governance of the University, it will be quite sufficient".

Gus Abols, president of SAC, said that he "would strongly urge the council to accept the principle of support staff participation in the governing council". He pointed out that the support staff "number in the thousands", and that some members, librarians for example, were "clearly part of the educational process".

SAC donated \$500 to the Stop Spadina-Save Our City Committee and will sponsor a petition on campus opposing construction of the Spadina Expressway.

Alan Powell, of the Department of Sociology and Erindale College, told the SAC members that the committee had support from all segments of the Toronto community and would help "any citizens' group interested in fighting the expressway".

The committee hopes to mobilize the city by Jan. 26 to exert sufficient pressure to have the expressway stopped at Lawrence Avenue. The committee is also pressing for a detailed study, if necessary by a Royal Commission, of Toronto's transport policy.

Mr. Powell said that he originally became involved with the issue because of the possibility that the expressway represented the beginning of the destruction of the ecology and economy of the city. "If we commit ourselves to an expressway system," Mr. Powell asserted, "we will never be able to afford an adequate rapid transport system—yet 26% of the people in Metro do not own a car."

Mr. Abols suggested that SAC go even further than the motion suggested, by sponsoring an educational program on the issue, and "perhaps some sort of demonstration on the 26th".

The council decided to buy a 43-acre plot of land adjoining a cabin currently being completed by the U of T Outing Club in the Collingwood district. The purchase is being made at the request of the Outing Club, which wants to ensure continued access to the land.

Mr. Abols, who made a study of the proposal over the holidays, told the council that the \$7,000 asking price was very low, ensuring that "if in a year or two we

decide we've made a mistake, we can always sell the land at a profit". In his estimation, the purchase is "a way of doing something tangible for students".

Mr. Abols brought before the council some draft proposals for the new year. One proposal was that \$300 be allotted to each council member to sponsor "students in his constituency that need a minimum amount of money to launch a new idea".

Mr. Abols favours amending the constitution to require each SAC representative to hold four open general meetings within his constituency each year. In cultural affairs, Mr. Abols recommends local singers and musicians to entertain students at lunch hours, hopefully on a daily basis.

"Serious consideration" should be given to the creation of an Ombudsman, selected by the whole community, who "should have the power to look at any document in the University" and who would "act as a watchdog over the bureaucracy", make recommendations, and handle all charges of racial discrimination.

Issues of major concern in the next term, in Mr. Abols's view, include working toward the establishment of a new university government, taking "a more active role" in the question of the Spadina expressway, and studying the Educational Opportunity Bank concept, so that SAC will be "well prepared to meet the issue and deal with it speedily and effectively".

Art Moses told the council that several members of the University administration had shown slides at a meeting of the Huron-Sussex Association which Mr. Moses understood to show proposed University expansion in that district. Mr. Moses said that SAC's request for copies had met with no success.

The council passed a motion asking the administration to make the maps public, and to supply copies to SAC and any person who requested them.

Craig Heron introduced a motion advocating student use of staff washrooms and elevators. "Pinch yourselves, people. I'm not doing this as a joke", said Mr. Heron.

The motion reads:

Whereas the present University system posits the implicit inferiority of students,

and whereas certain artificial distinctions exist in this university which symbolically reinforce an inequality between students and faculty members,

and whereas SAC believes in the essential equality of human beings,

moved that SAC demand that the administration of this University take the necessary steps to eliminate the distinction between students and staff washrooms and elevators on this campus,

and that if the administration fails to respond favourably in a reasonable length of time that SAC undertake a publicity campaign to encourage students to use the staff washrooms and elevators on this campus,

and that the president of SAC inform the University administration of the council's decision.

Mr. McEvoy suggested that the council vote separately on washrooms and elevators. Some buildings, said Mr. McEvoy, did not have sufficient elevator service for general use; this argument could not be applied to washrooms.

Mr. Heron said that the motion was designed "to indicate to students that there are symbols of their inferiority outside the classroom". The council passed the motion as it applies to washrooms, but decided to leave staff elevators to the staff.

### Elected to ATS Council

The Association for the Teaching Staff announces the election of two members of the Faculty of Arts and Science to membership in the ATS Council. They are Profs. Meyer Brownstone and Arthur Kruger, both of the Department of Political Economy.

## FORUM ON CUG

(Continued from page 2)

limitations may be imaginary or obsolete. They bring a variety of immediate background and hence an openness of approach that faculty, with their shared professional background, necessarily lack. Even the randomness and waywardness of some student voices is of immense value in a time of rapid change in social and intellectual realities. Experience is a great resource, but one may find out too late that it has been experience of the wrong thing.

On the specific issue of student involvement on committees making recommendations on faculty appointment, promotion, tenure and dismissal, the recent vote of the Faculty of Arts and Science is not surprising. Those opposed are very violently opposed, since they feel their position and that of the institution threatened; those in favour are unlikely to be very strongly in favour, and may not have bothered to attend the meeting at which the vote was taken. A poll would be interesting—but even more interesting would be a poll of students. To me, such participation still seems desirable: I agree with Mr. Abols that there seems to be no other way of ensuring that teaching ability is taken seriously, and ending the persistent allegations that it is not. Students are presumably no less able than anyone else to assess expert testimony and weigh arguments, and are likely to neutralize the kind of academic logrolling and infighting that can bedevil such committees. The argument that they might adduce irrelevant

political considerations seems no weightier than the counter-argument that they might expose the existing covert use of political criteria. The argument that the student voice here threatens scholarship seems absurd: the people to whom the presence of distinguished scholars is most important are not their colleagues, but the graduate students, and I have yet to meet a student who did not recognize high scholarly competence as a necessary condition of good teaching in many kinds of situation. The argument that a student participation in appointment and promotion might drive away the best scholars seems persuasive until one asks why they would go and where they would go. To me, implementation of the CUG proposals would seem a good reason for staying in Toronto—but not a decisive factor.

That the CUG report says nothing about scholarship is true, thank God. What it discusses is "research," the use of the institution's funds and facilities, with which a Commission on Government is properly concerned. Here, their recommendations would have sufficed to prevent the building of the Jodrell Bank telescope and the unravelling of the DNA molecule, and what more could be asked of a responsible body? Scholarship requires only leisure and *Sitzfleisch*, and the less the Administration bothers with it the better.

F. E. SPARSHOTT  
Chairman  
Department of Ethics  
Victoria College

## U of T community asked to help stop the Spadina Expressway

A concerted drive against the continuation of the Spadina Expressway is underway by the Stop Spadina, Save Our City Coordinating Committee, in which University of Toronto staff and students are taking a leading part.

Although the campaign is designed to enlist the support of all citizens, a special effort is being made to gain the support of the members of the University community, says Allan T. R. Powell, who is a member of the Sociology Department teaching staff and chairman of SSSOCCC, with Paul Reinhardt, graduate student in Political Economy, as co-chairman.

A petition is being circulated throughout Metropolitan Toronto, including the U of T campuses, by SSSOCCC and various ratepayers' associations. Signatures are being sought for a petition that "we, the undersigned citizens, demand that all work on the Spadina Expressway be halted immediately because the Expressway will cause more problems than it will solve. The search for more just and more practical alternatives must begin now!"

Members of the University staff, as well as the citizenry, are also being asked to write their reasons for opposing the Expressway in letters to the Hon. John Robarts, Premier of Ontario; to Hon. Darcy McKeough, Ontario Minister of Municipal Affairs; to Albert Camp-

bell, Chairman, Metropolitan Toronto Council; to William Dennison, Mayor, City of Toronto, and their aldermen.

Prof. Michael Marrus, History, is faculty liaison representative on SSSOCCC. The many students involved in the Committee's campaign include the treasurer, Bob Tennant, graduate student in Computer Science; and three undergraduates, Yvonne Macor and Larry Colle, secretaries of the Committee, and Kathy Stewart, liaison secretary.

The list of sponsors includes Prof. Stephen Clarkson and former Controller Margaret Campbell, both unsuccessful candidates for the Toronto city mayoralty in the December municipal election; Prof. Marshall McLuhan, Mrs. Jane Jacobs, the American authority on urban problems who now lives in Toronto; Ald. William Kilbourn, of York University, and two other aldermen, John Sewell and Ying Hope.

SSSOCCC has received financial help from Pollution Probe, the Students' Administrative Council, and individuals. The University has provided what Mr. Powell has called "human resources" for the campaign. But much more money is needed, the chairman says. Anyone willing to help the cause, especially with a cash contribution, is asked to get in touch with the SSSOCCC office at 373 Huron Street. In charge there is Mrs. Peggy Winnington Ball and the telephone number is 922-9121.

## EXHIBITIONS

Pictures on view in Alumni Hall, Victoria College — "Selections from the Picture Loan Gallery". Jan. 12 to 31, Monday to Friday. Tea will be served Wednesday, Jan. 21, 4 to 5:30 p.m.

"Art from the Island of God". The Indian children of Manitoulin Island tell their story through their paintings. Upper floor, Exhibition Hall, ROM. To Jan. 18.

"Focal Forum". Exhibition of prize-winning photographs selected by the Toronto Focal Forum from among the work of its members. Lower Rotunda. To Feb. 9.

"Batiks". Louis Steyn, South Africa's foremost batik artist exhibits more than 50 of his wildlife hangings. Exhibition Hall, ROM. To Feb. 11.

"McLaughlin Planetarium". "The Story of Eclipses". To Apr. 5. Tuesday to Friday,

3:30 and 8 p.m.; Saturday, 11 a.m., 2, 3:30, 5 and 8 p.m.; Sunday, 2, 3:30, 5 and 7:30 p.m. Adults \$1, students 50¢. Children under eight not admitted to the Star Theatre.

Display of Canadian Special Delivery Stamps from 1898 to 1946. Lower Rotunda. ROM. To Feb. 15.

"Building with Wood". Technology and preservation of early Ontario Buildings shown through drawings, artifacts and several examples from the ROM's McRae models of pioneer life. Third floor rotunda, ROM. To Feb. 15.

"Narrative of Discovery". Rare books, pictures, early maps and charts trace the exploration of Canada from the 15th to 19th centuries. Sigmund Samuel Canadiana Building. To March 29.



# COMING EVENTS

## JANUARY (Continued from page 1)

### 17 SATURDAY

Lecture "Exploration Beneath the Sea". Joseph B. MacInnis, Medical Director, Ocean Systems Inc., New York and Toronto. Convocation Hall. 8.15 p.m. (Royal Canadian Institute)

### 18 SUNDAY

Music Canadian Concerts Orchestra. Conductor, Walter Babiak. Scarborough College. 3.45 p.m. Free.

### 19 MONDAY

Seminar "Mathematics and Biology". Dr. R. D. Julius. Room 417, Charles H. Best Institute. 12.30 p.m. (Banting and Best Department of Medical Research)

Music Faculty of Music Ensembles. Concert Hall, Edward Johnson Building. 1 p.m. Free.

### 20 TUESDAY

Lectures "Na-K Transport in Cell Membrane". Dr. A. Sen. Room 2172, Medical Sciences Building. 4 p.m. (Department of Physiology)

"The Meaning of Military Dictatorship in Present Day Latin America". Prof. Florestan Fernandes, Brazilian sociologist now in residence, U of T. Room 1085, Sidney Smith Hall. 4.10 p.m. (Department of Sociology and the Latin American Studies Program)

"The Yorkshire Cycles: Variations on a Theme". Prof. Alexandra Johnston. Lecture Hall, Academic Building, Victoria University. 4.30 p.m. (Victoria College Public Lectures 1970)

Seminars "Structural Evolution of the Southern Canadian Rockies". Dr. R. A. Price, Department of Geological Sciences, Queen's University. Room 128, Mining Building. 4 p.m. Coffee 3.30 p.m. (Department of Geology)

"Scandinavian Forestry Practice and Woodlands Operations". Jean A. Berard, Manager, Woodlands section, Canadian Pulp and Paper Association, Montreal. Room 221, Galbraith Building. 4 p.m. (Faculty of Forestry)

Discussion "Is There an Employment Barrier?" A panel talks to Ralph Gauvreau, Canada Manpower and Immigration. Scarborough College. 8 p.m.

### 21 WEDNESDAY

Seminars "An Approach to Happenings". Prof. Darko Suvin, exchange professor from McGill. Upper Library, Massey College. 10 a.m. to noon. (Centre for the Study of Drama and School of Graduate Studies)

"Regulation of Vegetative and Reproductive Growth in Forest Trees". Dr. Donald A. Fraser, Petawawa Forest Experiment Station, Canadian Forestry Service. Room 221, Galbraith Building. 3.30 p.m. (School of Graduate Studies and Faculty of Forestry)

Tours "English Furniture"—Noon. "Mineralogy"—1 p.m. "Musical Instruments"—2 p.m. Armour Court, main floor, ROM.

Athletics Hockey. Windsor at Varsity. Varsity Arena. 8 p.m. Basketball. Waterloo at Varsity. Hart House. 8.15 p.m.

### 22 THURSDAY

Lectures "A Tree Physiologist Visits the U.S.S.R.". Dr. Donald A. Fraser. Room 103, Hygiene Building. 3.30 p.m. (School of Graduate Studies and Faculty of Forestry)

"The Life and Adventures of the Naturalist on H.M.S. Beagle". Prof. W. E. Swinton. Centennial Centre of Science and Technology, 770 Don Mills Road. 8 p.m. (Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology and Canadian Society for the History and Philosophy of Science)

"Finalism Revisited" series. "Finalism and Physical Probability". Prof. Etienne Gilson. Carr Hall, St. Michael's College. 4.10 p.m. (Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies)

"Pesticides—Harvest of Death". Dr. D. A. Chant. Room 4, ROM. 8.30 p.m. Admission \$1.50. ROM Members free.

Colloquium "Theory of Supremovae". Dr. Philip Morrison, Department of Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Room 102, McLennan Physical Laboratories, 4.10 p.m. (School of Graduate Studies and Departments of Astronomy and Physics)

### 23 FRIDAY

Ball Arts and Science Faculty Ball. Supper, dancing, cards. Tickets, \$9 per person, available from Mrs. D. A. Stager (924-4261). Great Hall, Hart House. 7 p.m. to 1 a.m. (University Arts Women's Club)

Seminar "Dark-Field Electron Microscopy: A Direct Look at Macromolecules". Dr. Peter Ottensmeyer, Ontario Cancer Institute. Room 417, Charles H. Best Institute. 4 p.m. (Banting and Best Department of Medical Research)

Colloquium "Science in Science Fiction". Prof. Darko Suvin, McGill University. Rhodes Room, Trinity College. 2.10 p.m. (Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology)

### 24 SATURDAY

Lectures "Inner Frontiers—the Extension of Living Imagination into Spiritual Reality". L. Francis Edmunds, Principal, Emerson College, England. Medical Sciences Auditorium. 8 p.m. (Student Anthroposophic Forum)

"Studies of Moon Rocks". Prof. David W. Strangway. Convocation Hall. 8.15 p.m. (Royal Canadian Institute)

Athletics Basketball. Guelph at Varsity. Hart House. 2 p.m.

Hockey. Cornell at Varsity. Varsity Arena. 8 p.m.

### 25 SUNDAY

Music University of Toronto Concert Band. Conductors, Robert A. Rosevear, Herbert C. Mueller. MacMillan Theatre, Edward Johnson Building. 3 p.m. No admission charge. (Faculty of Music)

Menotti's "The Telephone" and Poulenc's "La Voix Humaine". James Colbeck production. Scarborough College. Admission free. 3.45 p.m.

### 26 MONDAY

Music Recital, Louis-Philippe Pelletier, piano. Concert Hall, Edward Johnson Building. 1 p.m. Free. (Faculty of Music)

### 27 TUESDAY

Lectures "Great Dane of Destiny: Soren Kierkegaard To-Day". Prof. D. V. Wade. Lecture Hall, Academic Building, Victoria University. 4.30 p.m. (Victoria College Public Lectures 1970)

"Controlled Treatment Study of Patients with Transient Ischaemic Attacks and Cervical Carotid Lesions". Dr. Wm. Fields, Professor

#### Seminar

of Neurology, University of Texas. Osler Hall, Academy of Medicine. 5 p.m. (Toronto Neurological Society)

"The 'Sigma 5' in the Division of Medical Computing". A. Heyworth. Room 417, Charles H. Best Institute. 12.30 p.m. (Banting and Best Department of Medical Research)

### 28 WEDNESDAY

Lectures "Acetylcholine Turnover at Nerve Endings". Dr. F. C. MacIntosh, Department of Physiology, McGill University. Room 4171, Medical Sciences Building. 4 p.m. (School of Graduate Studies and Department of Pharmacology)

"Facts, Figures, Perceptions and Myths—Ways of Describing and Understanding Crime". Dr. J. W. Mohr. Room 3153, Medical Sciences Building. 7.30 p.m. (Centre of Criminology)

Tours Noon—first floor; 1 p.m.—second floor; 2 p.m.—third floor. ROM. Free.

### 29 THURSDAY

Lecture "Finalism Revisited" series. "Evolution, Teleology and Theology". Prof. Etienne Gilson. Carr Hall, St. Michael's College. 4.10 p.m. (Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies)

Music University of Toronto Concert Choir. Concert Hall, Edward Johnson Building. 2 p.m. Free. (Faculty of Music)

### 30 FRIDAY

Athletics Hockey. Loyola at Varsity. Varsity Arena. 8 p.m.

## STAFF NOTES

### Victoria College

PROF. E. J. REVELL attended the Fifth World Congress of Jewish Studies in Jerusalem in August, where he read a paper entitled "A New Subsystem of Tiberopalestinian Pointing".

### Scarborough College

DR. J. A. CHEYNE gave a colloquium at the Fels Research Institute in Yellow Springs, Ohio, in September on "Some Effects of Direct and Vicarious Reinforcement".

PROF. JOHN H. YOUSON was in Montreal on Dec. 10 to present a seminar to the Department of Anatomy, McGill University, on "The Morphology of the Kidney of the Great Lakes Sea Lamprey, *Petromyzon Marinius* L".

On Oct. 30 DR. G. A. YARRANTON gave a seminar on "Comparative Autecology" at the Department of Biology, Dalhousie University.

### Erindale College

PROF. IRWIN M. SPIGEL presented a paper entitled "Extinction of the Excretory Alkali Metal Response (EAMR) in a Reptile" at the Psychonomic Society meeting in St. Louis, Nov. 6 to 8.

### Medicine

DR. J. A. LITTLE gave a lecture on Oct. 2 to the Ontario College of General Practice meeting, Toronto, entitled "Serum Lipids and Lipoproteins in Medical Practice". From Oct. 22 to 26 he attended the symposium on The Impact of Food Processing on Nutrition, Montebello, Que., and read a paper entitled "Nutrition in Adults with Metabolic Diseases". Dr. Little also attended the Third Hoechst Diabetes Workshop on "Lipid Metabolism" at Mont Gabriel, Que., Oct. 27-28, and on Nov. 8 a seminar, "Exercise for the Cardiac Patient — Pros and Cons" at the Toronto Rehabilitation Centre where he presented a paper entitled "Physical Activity and Atherogenesis: (1) Pre-Infarct, (2) Post-Infarct".

DR. BARBARA BIRCHWOOD attended the International Meeting on Atherosclerosis in Chicago from Nov. 1 to 5. Also attending the meeting were DRs. GEORGE STEINER and AUBIE ANGEL.

DR. K. J. R. WIGHTMAN addressed the Hamilton Medical Legal Society Oct. 29 on the topic, "Impairment by Medication".

### Pharmacy

DEAN F. N. HUGHES participated in the ceremony of the laying of the cornerstone of the School of Pharmacy, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, on Oct. 8. Dean Hughes was recently elected chairman of the Association of Faculties of Pharmacy of Canada. PROF. J. G. NAIRN was re-elected secretary-treasurer.

DR. CHARLES H. HOCKMAN gave a Neurophysiology Seminar on Nov. 13 at the Rockefeller University. His presentation was entitled "Limbic System Modulation of Autonomic Reflexes".

### The Executive Committee for hospitals' planning group

In addition to R. A. Davies, Q.C., the Chairman, the Executive Committee of the Independent Planning Committee, established to serve the University of Toronto Hospitals System, consists of T. J. Bell, Chairman of the Board, Toronto General Hospital; Bertrand Gerstein, Chairman of the Board, and Sidney Liswood, Executive Director, New Mount Sinai Hospital; A. Bruce Matthews (then) Chairman of the Board, and J. Boyd McAuley, Executive Director, Toronto Western Hospital; B. H. Rieger, Chairman of the Board, Sunnybrook Hospital; H. M. Turner, Chairman of the Board, Wellesley Hospital; Dr. John D. Hamilton, Vice-President Health Sciences, U of T; Dr. K. J. R. Wightman, (then) Chairman, Department of Medicine; Dr. R. B. Holmes, Chairman, Department of Radiology; Dr. A. L. Chute, Dean, Faculty of Medicine; Dr. B. Beris, Physician-in-Chief, New Mount Sinai Hospital; Dr. D. R. Wilson, Surgeon-in-Chief, Toronto Western Hospital; Dr. R. C. A. Hunter, Chairman, Department of Psychiatry, U of T.

## Ph.D. Orals

#### Tuesday, January 27

Mrs. Eleanor P. Vicari, Department of English. "Learning and Imagination in Robert Burton". Thesis supervisors: Profs. N. J. Endicott and M. MacLure. Room 207, 65 St. George Street. 10 a.m.

Desh Deepak Ghadha, Department of Chemistry. "The Interaction of Porous Carbon with Molecular Oxygen". Thesis supervisor: Prof. M. J. Dignam. Room 201, 65 St. George Street. 2 p.m.

#### Thursday, January 29

Frank Richard Foulkes, Department of Chemical Engineering. "Membrane Fuel Cells". Thesis supervisor: Prof. W. F. Graydon. Room 128, Lash Miller Building. 2 p.m.

Winston Collins, Department of English. "The Hero in Tennyson's Longer Poems". Thesis supervisor: Prof. F. E. L. Priestley. Room 201, 65 St. George Street. 2 p.m.

#### Friday, January 30

Miss Lindsay Niemann, Department of Anthropology. "The Natural History of the Moriori". Thesis supervisors: Profs. D. Hughes and B. Yamaguchi. Room 201, 65 St. George Street. 10 a.m.

All members of the Graduate Faculty have the right to attend Ph.D. oral examinations.

#### Wednesday, January 21

Miss Elizabeth Greene, Department of English. "Ezra Pound and François Villon: A Solution in Lyric Sequence". Thesis supervisor: Prof. W. F. Blissett. Room 207, 65 St. George Street. 10 a.m.

#### Friday, January 23

Gregory Gaylord Fahman, Department of Astronomy. "Structure and Stability of Rapidly Rotating Supermassive Stars". Thesis supervisor: Prof. S. P. S. Anand. Room 201, 65 St. George Street. 10 a.m.

Jack E. Mercer, Department of English. "The Political Attitudes and Affiliations of Jonathan Swift with Particular Emphasis on His Relations with the Harleyan Ministry". Thesis supervisor: Prof. G. G. Falle. Room 207, 65 St. George Street. 2 p.m.

#### Monday, January 26

Henry Vivian Nelles, Department of History. "The Politics of Development: Forests, Mines and Hydro-Electric Power in Ontario, 1890-1939". Thesis supervisor: Prof. D. G. Creighton. Room 207, 65 St. George Street. 1.30 p.m.